

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

**S&K CONVENIENT IMAN, INC**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CRUM & FORSTER INDEMNITY  
COMPANY**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 5:21-cv-248**

**DEFENDANT’S NOTICE OF REMOVAL**

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1441 and 1446, Defendant Crum & Forster Indemnity Company (“Crum & Forster”) files this Notice of Removal on the basis of diversity of citizenship and jurisdictional amount, and respectfully shows the Court the following:

**REMOVAL IS TIMELY**

1. Crum & Forster is the Defendant in Cause No. 2021-CI-01973 filed in the 166th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas, styled *S&K Convenient Iman Inc. v. Crum & Forster Indemnity Company*. Plaintiffs commenced this civil action against Crum & Forster in the state court on February 2, 2021. Crum & Forster was first served with Plaintiff’s Original Petition (the “Petition”) on February 11, 2021.

2. Therefore, service of process in this cause was served on Crum & Forster not more than thirty (30) days before the filing of this notice, and this Notice of Removal is being filed within one year of the date suit was first filed in state court.

### **BASIS FOR REMOVAL**

3. Removal is proper based upon diversity of citizenship under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(a), 1441(a) and 1446.

#### **A. There is Complete Diversity**

4. In its Original Petition, Plaintiff S&K Convenient Iman Inc. (“S&K”) acknowledges that it is a citizen of the State of Texas residing in Bexar County. (Pl.’s Orig. Pet. at ¶ 2) Additionally, the Plaintiff owns the insured property located at 3500 Broadway, San Antonio, Texas in Bexar county. (Pl.’s Orig. Pet. at ¶ 8)

5. Both at the time the lawsuit was originally filed, and at the time of removal, Defendant Crum & Forster is a corporation incorporated and existing under the laws of Delaware, keeping its principal place of business in Morristown, New Jersey.

#### **B. The Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$75,000.00**

6. This is a civil action in which the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional limits of \$75,000.00. In determining the amount in controversy, the Court may consider, “penalties, statutory damages, and punitive damages.” *St Paul Reinsurance Co, Ltd v Greenberg*, 134 F.3d 1250, 1253 (5th Cir. 1998); *see also Ray v State Farm Lloyds*, 1999 WL 151667, at \*2 - 3 (N.D. Tex. 1999) (finding sufficient amount in controversy in plaintiff’s case against the insurer for breach of contract, bad faith, violations of the Texas Insurance Code and Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act and mental anguish). Plaintiff alleges that Crum & Forster is liable for breach of contract, common law fraud, conspiracy to commit fraud, common law and statutory bad faith, and violations of Chapters 541 and 542 of the Texas Insurance. Plaintiffs seek to recover actual damages, exemplary damages, compensatory damages, additional statutory damages, post-judgment interest, and reasonable and necessary attorneys’ fees. Plaintiff’s Original Petition does

not allege an amount in controversy, but its pre-suit notice letter identifies actual damages and attorneys' fees of at least \$200,000 (Attached as Exhibit B). Accordingly, the amount in controversy clearly exceeds \$75,000.<sup>1</sup>

7. Accordingly, by virtue of diversity of citizenship the United States district courts have original jurisdiction.

#### **STATE COURT DOCUMENTS BEING FILED**

8. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(a), attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is the Index of Matters Being Filed that clearly identifies each document and indicates the date the document was filed in state court. Attached as Exhibit "C" is a copy of the docket sheet, and all documents filed in the state court action are attached.

#### **PRAYER**

Therefore, based upon 28 U.S.C. §§1441 and 1446, Crum & Forster respectfully requests that this action be removed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division, and that it be granted such other and further relief to which it may show itself justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMPSON, COE, COUSINS & IRONS, L.L.P.

By: /s/ Christopher H. Avery  
BRIAN S. MARTIN  
State Bar No. 13055350  
E-Mail: [bmartin@thompsoncoe.com](mailto:bmartin@thompsoncoe.com)  
CHRISTOPHER H. AVERY  
State Bar No. 24069321  
E-Mail: [cavery@thompsoncoe.com](mailto:cavery@thompsoncoe.com)  
One Riverway, Suite 1400  
Houston, TX 77056

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Theodoridis v. Balboa Ins. Co.*, CV G-10-497, 2011 WL 13257650, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. Feb. 3, 2011), *report and recommendation adopted*, CV G-10-497, 2011 WL 13257647 (S.D. Tex. Feb. 24, 2011) (denying Motion to Remand where pre-suit demand letter sought approximately \$46,000).

Telephone: (713) 403-8210  
Telecopy: (713) 403-8299

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
CRUM & FORSTER INDEMNITY COMPANY**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been forwarded to all counsel of record.

Cristobal M. Galindo  
Joe Gibson  
GALINDO LAW  
4151 Southwest Freeway, Suite 602  
Houston, Texas 77027  
StormCase@GalindoLaw.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

/s/ Christopher H. Avery  
CHRISTOPHER H. AVERY